

SECRET

COPY 1 of 3 COPIES

CIA CAREER COUNCIL

65th Meeting

Thursday, 25 May 1961

SECRET

SECRET

CIA CAREER COUNCIL

65th Meeting

Thursday, 25 May 1961

DCI Conference Room

2:00 - 3:20 p.m.

. . . . The 65th Meeting of the CIA Career Council convened at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday, 25 May 1961, in the DCI Conference Room, with the following present:

25X1A9a	Emmett D. Echols, Chairman
	Robert Amory, Jr., Member
	Matthew Baird, Member
	[REDACTED]
	Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Member
25X1A9a	Lawrence K. White, Member
	[REDACTED], Executive Secretary
	[REDACTED] Acting Secretary
25X1A9a	Lawrence R. Houston, General Counsel
	[REDACTED] Alternate Member

. . . . Following is a verbatim transcript of this meeting

25X1A9a MR. ECHOLS: First I'd like to say that unless there is some objection,
Mr. [REDACTED] will be the Executive Secretary.

Any comments on the two sets of minutes attached to the agenda?

MR. BAIRD: I move they be accepted.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Second.

MR. ECHOLS: We will now go to item 2 on the agenda, which is a small brief and a proposed draft Regulation, which is here for just general views. There has been no attempt to formally coordinate it. It contains a few new ideas.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: May I ask a question? Is one of your objectives here to end up with fewer categories of personnel?

MR. ECHOLS: I think factually we end up with more. This structure which I have outlined here is similar in many respects to those of the competitive Civil

SECRET

SECRET

Service. They use the terminology, of course, of temporary appointments; they use the terminology of career conditional; and they use the terminology of career appointments. This picks up the concept of the reserve appointment that is in the Foreign Service structure. The major difference between our career conditional as suggested here and that of the competitive Civil Service is that at the end of a 3-year period in the competitive service one automatically, without any further action, is considered to be in the career category. I think that, in terms of what we have built on in the past - the idea of Career Service, the review of an individual's performance by his Career Service, and acceptance into the Career Staff, we have tried to give a certain stature to this and a modus operandi for entering into that status. Unless we want to abandon that completely, I think we want to make this transference from one status to another a deliberate exercise, and this, I think, will in addition provide a legal basis for whatever program of benefits and advantages that we may want to develop over the years for our true career people. At the present time we don't have any solid basis for developing anything like this. We can't differentiate between our career people and those who might be here because we have a three-year need to expand our Agency to meet some situation. Now maybe I'm not orienting my presentation here very much, but the reserve category I would hope we would use to meet temporary needs to expand the Agency to meet a Korean situation or something like that, or to bring in specialists who have no intention of making a career in the Agency, and don't desire it, and we don't want them to, but we need them to do a specific job; for example, the new building planning jobs -- things like this -- for three or four years' duration. You go out and hire specialists to do this job, and everybody understands they are here for this purpose. And you leave them out of our career program. These are term appointments, and when they expire and their term is up we have no problems whatsoever of disposing of the person, and we don't have to run a 701 exercise or a selection out on them.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Once you are hired by the Government how does the Government divest itself of you? Suppose you want to stay, and you say, "I've changed my mind - I want to stay for seven more years." How do we get rid of them?

MR. ECHOLS: Let me say the legal basis for this is that it specifies the term of the appointment.

SECRET

SECRET

MR. HOUSTON: What in effect we have, being exempt from the classified Civil Service, is that we make contracts to the employees. Our oath of appointment is an open contract. But we can close it. We can have a one year contract, a 90-day, or a five year contract--whatever we want.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] You can do that?

MR. HOUSTON: Yes.

MR. BAIRD: I read this very well written, short Regulation, but I couldn't answer myself, at the end, well, what does it really do? What does it do to satisfy those who at one time thought there was a big umpty-dumpty-do Career Service set up in CIA?

MR. ECHOLS: Several persons have mentioned this: This doesn't tell me what you are aiming at. There was no attempt in this Regulation to set forth a full career program. I would hope that this Regulation would only provide the legal framework, if adopted, upon which we would build. And there would be other policies relating to many programs which could be carried out with this legal framework. But first you need the framework. And my only purpose here would be to establish by regulation the legal framework of appointment actions, each with a peculiar significance, and with this framework you can then build your programs of all different kinds, including developmental programs.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Do you feel this would give us more flexibility, Emmett, than we have now?

MR. ECHOLS: Yes, much more flexibility.

MR. BAIRD: This makes your job easier?

MR. ECHOLS: It will in future years.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It would make everybody's job easier, it seems to me, in one way. One thing that interests me and is perhaps more to the point than my original question is: Do you feel that this will result in fewer persons being true careerists?

MR. ECHOLS: I would think that under this program 90% of our people would be careerists. I'm just making a guesstimation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You mean 90% of the eligibles? You have only about 67% of the Agency in the Career Service - simply because they haven't served their 3 years.

SECRET

SECRET

MR. ECHOLS: Yes.

And the size of the reserve category we cannot anticipate. I think it will generally be very small, but if you did have something where there was a need to expand the Agency rapidly for a specified purpose, and you know it's a short range purpose - short term, probably two or three or four years - I would bring them in as reservists. And should I be wrong - should subsequent events show this is going to be a permanent activity, needs permanent staffing, you can always convert from a reservist to a regular appointment.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How would you handle the case, for example, of a retired officer from the Foreign Service or another Government Department or the military who had an ability that we wanted but he had already completed one career in the Government. Would he come in and still be eligible for the Career Service, or would he be a reservist?

25X1A9a

MR. ECHOLS: Let's personify this a little bit. Take [REDACTED] for example--I think it would have been ideal if he could have come in as a reservist - if he had a reserve appointment for a 5-year span.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You are very perceptive, because this is something I've been laboring with for three years, and I have never sent in [REDACTED] applica-
25X1A9a for Career Service because I don't believe this was ever what I intended Career Service to be -- and this isn't something I've done behind his back - I have talked to him about it, and he is a well-qualified man for a period of time. But Career Service if it's going to mean anything should also mean protection and status. It seems to me if we ever had a big cut down and White said to me I had to cut the IG

25X1A9a Staff in half, [REDACTED] would obviously be one of the first to go, because he was retired once, and he is back here because he has a contribution to make. Am I wrong in that philosophy?

MR. ECHOLS: No, I don't think so.

MR. BAIRD: And you would say the JOT's would all come in under the career provisional program?

MR. ECHOLS: Yes.

MR. BAIRD: And you think this would make just as good a recruiting pitch to them as the method used now?

SECRET

SECRET

MR. ECHOLS: I wouldn't think it would make a serious difference to them.

MR. BAIRD: You already hire him on a year's probation, and he now has to wait three years to become a member of the Career Staff.

MR. ECHOLS: At the end of three years if you don't want him he wouldn't want to stay.

MR. BAIRD: What would you do then at the end of three years?

MR. ECHOLS: Now my first draft of this spelled it out - what would happen when a man has been here three years and has met the other criterion of being age 25 - and it might be more than three years - at that point he might have been with us six or seven years -- what would happen at this point? In almost every case the Career Service concerned - the "using Office" - has had ample time to judge this individual and his performance and so on, and they know whether or not they want him in their Career Service. If they do want him, they would recommend his appointment, then, as a career employee. And I think this should be legalized with a personnel action. Now supposing for some flukey reason - and I can think of two reasons: one, a recent transfer from one Career Service to another, so that the new, receiving Career Service has not had a chance to evaluate the man--

MR. BAIRD: That is the JOT, you see.

MR. ECHOLS (Continuing): --or an individual who has recently gotten into a little mix-up or scrape of some kind - maybe having trouble with his wife, or something like that, and you say you want to take a little more time to see if this guy survives the problem he is having, I would say you could recommend postponement of action for up to a year. And that is stated here on page 3 (reading):

"The head of the Career Service will carefully evaluate the individual's suitability for selection as a Career Employee and will recommend to the Director of Personnel that the employee be converted to Career Employee status, or that decision be deferred for a period not to exceed one year, or that other specific action be taken."

Now what is that "other specific action"? I had it all spelled out, and then I scrubbed it because I think this is a better approach in this Regulation. You might recommend that the man be converted to a reserve appointment. You have looked at the man, you have decided he is not career material, you need his services right now for the next couple of years, and you want to give him a chance to make an orderly move

SECRET

SECRET

to another career, so you offer him a reserve appointment for two years -- and he knows, then, that if he makes this conversion it's a term appointment and at the end of two years he automatically is out, and he hasn't a job, so he very probably is going to look for another job on an orderly basis. Now supposing the head of the Career Service looks at this man and says: "I don't want him as a careerist, I have made my judgment, and I don't want to stall on it any longer, and I not only recommend that I don't need his services but I don't even want him around." The unspoken action here is you take action to remove the man from Agency employment. And, among other things, I think that with this type of approach it would be a very easy matter for the Career Service to counsel this man six or nine months ahead of time and tell him: "When you complete your time here we don't think we are going to recommend your conversion to career status"--and again let the man go out and make his own shift. In other words, you get rid of people by counseling them in their own best interests rather than throwing them out the front door.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] If he didn't accept this change in status you would then have to bring normal procedures into effect. You couldn't force him--

MR. HOUSTON: The way we look at this paper, there are just two types of appointments - one is indefinite and one is temporary.

MR. ECHOLS: One is indefinite and one is term.

MR. HOUSTON: And, if no time was set, at the end of three years he would be out.

MR. ECHOLS: This is a new idea Larry gives me. I didn't realize we could make a term appointment that would be indefinite in length.

MR. HOUSTON: It would be conditioned on specific criteria ascertainable in advance.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is this a technique that we could use to simply avoid hiring a person on contract and having him work in our staff cadre?

MR. HOUSTON: In pure concept all people are hired on pure contract. It's just when we leave it indefinite a certain impact of Government practice takes over. So we can make the contract what we want.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But you feel you could hire somebody to do a research job on a research project and say: Your tenure is simply while this project is in

SECRET

SECRET

effect, and we don't know how long it will take.

MR. HOUSTON: We would do it on a contract basis.

MR. ECHOLS: It wouldn't be an appointment, it would be a contract.

MR. HOUSTON: But really our appointments are a different form of contract, in essence.

MR. BAIRD: The only blanket group of employees who I can see that this may cause some difficulty with is one very small group of the OCS/JOT's who spend two years with the military but are given credit for those two years, and about whom we know not very much at the end of three years, however. So they would be put in that reserve category?

MR. HOUSTON: Or not even put them in the reserve - just extend their provisional status.

MR. BAIRD: There are a large number of JOT's who go to the DD/P but who spend their first two years on the T/O of the Office of Training, and then go to DD/P for a determination on career status.

MR. ECHOLS: Well, you can get an extension for an additional year and that would give you two years, then.

MR. BAIRD: I'm just trying to figure out what their psychology would be here if we postpone their membership in the career staff.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And particularly if they're behind people who came in with them in the same group.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] As it is now they go into the Career Service--

MR. BAIRD: At the end of three years - just automatically, because they are sent an application form through the Office of Personnel, you see, and not from the Clandestine Services.

MR. ECHOLS: Well, couldn't you make your judgment after two years in the JOT program and after one year on the job; couldn't you make your judgment?

MR. BAIRD: I think we could, yes. But I'm at the point where I'm so sensitive to the JOT's - having some of the good ones resigning, that I don't want to put any other barrier to their wanting to stay in our outfit and being motivated for Career Service.

MR. ECHOLS: Among other things I think this will give us a more

SECRET

accurately identified group of people that you want to work with on rotational assignments, development assignments, training programs, and things like this, as opposed to just one mass of employees.

COLONEL WHITE: I think that is a step in the right direction. I also think that it's important that we get out something. There is an awful lot of uncertainty in the Agency now - a tremendous amount - as to whether we have abandoned the Career Service concept completely or not.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I was asked this in the Clandestine Services Review Course, and I didn't know what the question went to.

25X1A MR. KIRKPATRICK: The withdrawal of the Regulation on the Career Staff because of Regulations [REDACTED]

25X1A MR. ECHOLS: The old Regulation [REDACTED] gave retention preference to Career Staff employees.

MR. BAIRD: I think you have to look at it this way, too - that there are going to be a lot of people, however, who will say: Well, the one that was rescinded at least made something of the Career Service concept, and the one that replaced it doesn't, so this means we're just like any other employee in Government.

MR. ECHOLS: This would reestablish immediately the process of taking people into a "career corps" - let's put it that way--we used to call it "Career Staff", now it's a career appointment.

COLONEL WHITE: Emmett, what do you expect to get out of us today on this?

MR. ECHOLS: Well, if the idea is worth pursuing, I presume then we might want to farm it out for further coordination among the directorates.

MR. HOUSTON: Yes - because I think we would have some views on the actual wording.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I think it's neat, tidy, and useful. I like it.

COLONEL WHITE: I personally think it's a principle we should pursue, but it's so important I think I'd like for my Office Heads at least to see it and comment on it. But I don't think we ought to delay it for too long.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Fine with me.

MR. ECHOLS: Okay. It's agreed, then, that we will send copies to each directorate for their further consideration and comments.

COLONEL WHITE: Why don't you let us as Deputies--

SECRET

65-00-
11111'61

SECRET

MR. ECHOLS: That is what I say - we will send copies to each of the Deputies for further exploratory action.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I see no percentage in that -- just send it to the General Counsel and when he has had his druthers that will be the end of it. [Laughter]

MR. ECHOLS: Now Mr. Houston is also here for item 3 on the agenda - in view of Mr. Kirkpatrick's memorandum -- which you haven't all read, because we have kept it very much under the deck -- raising certain questions about our retirement policy.

. . . . Copies of the Memo for the DCI (DD/S 61-1489, ER 61-3427) signed by Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, IG, dated 28 April 1961, subject: Voluntary Retirement at Age 62 Under Notice No. [REDACTED] were then distributed to the members present

25X1A

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If I may speak here, this memorandum which you are about to receive originated as a result of a letter which an officer in the Agency wrote to the Director--and he is identified in this memo by name--protesting rather vehemently against the 62 year old retirement program. Further, as you may all have noted, it has gotten to the press. Joseph Young in the Evening Star had a column on it, and he had done a little research beyond his replying to a complaint from one of our employees, and in fact it was a column which was rather much on our side - saying that the Civil Service Commission had said that if we wanted to retire them at 62 we could retire them at 62. And further, we have had, and I'm sure we will have others, who have protested to the White House and to the Congress. So what the purpose of this memo is is not in any way to suggest that we drop the program but simply to suggest, as was contained on page 4 of the memo, that the Career Council give attention to the effectiveness of the program; whether we want to continue it--and I'm sure in my mind that we do; its affect on Agency recruiting - which I would think would be good rather than bad; the interpretation that has generally been placed - and I think Larry as head of the Retirement Panel can comment on that; and then recommendation (e) here is something which I think should be done - maybe not on a blanket basis but certainly within components; and (f) is something for consideration.

MR. ECHOLS: Of these six aspects to be reviewed, I think a report by Larry

SECRET

SECRET

might cover three or four of them and provide information for judgment on the others.

MR. HOUSTON: All right. From my side of it, I was nominated to be Chairman of something called the Agency Retirement Board, and we started to work -
[REDACTED] and myself - a year ago January. We found some difficulty at first, and we still have some difficulty, in running our part of the program due to one of the points raised here--which I hope to come back to later--why we instituted it and what specifically we are after. However, we have gone ahead and developed working arrangements for the Board and its Executive Secretary, and policy statements which I believe are within the Director's overall policy but differ somewhat for the three major components. The DD/P is the most stringent; in fact, very, very few policy exceptions are made by him--and he wanted the earliest possible action on those eligible. The other extreme is the DD/I, who has a good many people who work well and sometimes better as they get older - even after the mandatory retirement age; however, the DD/I follows the policy but in a somewhat more elastic manner than the DD/P. The DD/S is closer to the DD/P but has a little more elasticity in its application.

. . . . Mr. Amory joined the meeting at this point, and

Mr. [REDACTED] withdrew

MR. HOUSTON (Continuing): They sound somewhat contradictory, but we think they are working to the best interests of the various components involved, as far as we can see it from the Board's point of view. I have a statistical report as of 19 May 1961 covering those eligible for retirement through 1960 in which there were 241 in the Agency; actually retired in 1960 - 56; already retired in 1961 - 15; retirements now scheduled and a firm date set in 1961 - 55. So we've got 126 about which there is no problem.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: This is eligible for retirement through the calendar year 1960?

MR. HOUSTON: That is right.

MR. ECHOLS: You touched item 12 there, too.

MR. HOUSTON: 48 people altogether were extended by the components - were

SECRET

SECRET

given specific exemption for reasons important to the component, and are made up of people who are overseas and a few who were exempt from the Agency policy by the fact of their circumstances, and unwitting employees down at [REDACTED] 25X1A6a

Then retirements scheduled for 1962: 48 -- and these are included in those figures for those extended by the component or extended by the Retirement Board. The Retirement Board has given 36 extensions, and these are entirely on some compassionate ground. We don't feel we have any right or prerogative to barge into the command channel, but if the command channel decides they don't want to exempt a man because of special skills then we consider other aspects of the individual's case and come back through the command channel to recommend extensions. That type of case that is most frequent has to do with a type such as a receptionist. We have a case here of a receptionist who is age 63. She entered the Agency in 1952. If she were to retire now her annuity would be \$627.00 -- and I just don't think we can ask someone to get out of the Agency on that annuity and with no real prospect for employment outside of the Agency with no prior work experience. However, we are very concerned about these people when they become 70 and have to get out. So while we are extending them, at the same time we are asking them to go to the Executive Secretary of our Board, and other people in Personnel, and to come to grips with the problem they will be faced with at 70. Their annuity wouldn't be much more - it probably wouldn't be over \$800.00. Then insofar as possible encourage them to go out as early as they can and get work which with their small annuities will make them better off than they would be by remaining with the Government until a later time. Now those are the only ones to whom we give sort of indefinite extensions, and we say that we will review their cases from year to year. Others have come in and asked for a year or 11 months, or something like that, on the basis that if they don't get 12 years in they will lose their FEGLI or Benefit Health Insurance, and usually we consider it is in the Agency's interest to go along with this and we have recommended extensions. So, as I say, there are 36 of those. And we have only had one or two on which there has been an inquiry back through the command channel. At the present time there is only one Agency employee flatly fighting retirement -- saying he won't do anything about retiring, although he is currently eligible, and that is a special case because his case is up in the Director's office for possible separation on other grounds.

SECRET

SECRET

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] is the only other one who indicated he might not accept the policy as applied to him, but he has come a long way around. It's quite interesting - some of the ones who were adamant at first either by persuasion or some other approach have come around.

Now I want to ask this group's opinion about this. The Retirement Board is really performing a personnel function, but I think one thing it does do - people might feel pretty strongly about retirement when they are told about it by their supervisor. But then they are interviewed by [REDACTED] 25X1A9a who instructs them, etc., and often they are still pretty tough minded about what they want to do. Then they appeal - have their case brought before our Board, and they finally have a piece of paper, signed by me as Chairman, saying that the Agency sees no reason to exempt them from the policy. I think this brings pretty hard pressure on the guy. That is, as far as I can see, the main function of the Retirement Board at this time. And if we are going to stay away from using the Director's authority to enforce this--which the Director has not seen fit to do--and I have no desire to perpetuate this Board for my own reasons - in fact, I'd be very glad to be relieved, but if you think it serves a useful purpose, I'll stay on, although I think there should be a rotation of membership.

COLONEL WHITE: I think any Board of this kind should have representation from all three of the directorates, even though somebody like the Director of Personnel might chair it, and if you accept the fact that in order to be effective it should have the kind of representation which it has, I think it's still just a little bit better to be like it is than to have it chaired by Personnel - where people will say, "The Personnel Office is doing this to us" -- and if Otto Guthe is sitting on the Board and a DD/I man is being considered then he has some feeling that he is getting a fair shake and not being handled arbitrarily. I think it's very helpful to keep it like it is.

MR. AMORY: There is a certain amount of merit in not rushing this rotation business too fast. Otto has given a lot of serious thought to this, as I'm sure

[REDACTED] has, but as you develop this body of law and precedent and guidance on this -
25X1A9a I think this should go on for three or four years and maybe then rotate one at a time.

MR. HOUSTON: Yes, I was thinking of rotating only one at a time. And

SECRET

SECRET

sometimes it has been quite time-consuming, and both Eric and Otto have put a lot of time on this.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why not leave it as it is for a year. But I think the continuity right now as we get rolling on this, is important.

COLONEL WHITE: I think the Board has accomplished a lot.

25X1A9a

MR. HOUSTON: [REDACTED] is trying to keep himself informed on the actual cases, and certainly the great majority of these 126 cases had not thought of retiring before this policy was put in -- in fact, he knows of none that had actually planned to retire - that he has talked to. So it has an effect.

MR. AMORY: As to what the Board accomplishes, I'd like to ask a policy question here. The more I think of it the more I think that we don't have to have or shouldn't have a uniform policy that brackets what you do with a GS-3, GS-4, or GS-5 receptionist or stenographer with what you do with a GS-15 high-level administrator. The latter clearly should be dropped if his staying blocks promotions all the way down the line, etc. But as a practical proposition, you keep a woman pounding a typewriter as a GS-5 and all that does is it blocks a recruitment out of Katie Gibbs who has no equity in working for CIA. I noticed, somewhat to my horror at first, that we have a woman working for the USIB who is 76 and going strong, and she is an absolutely first-class typist, and I've been told she is all by herself and that she would die if she lost her job, so Sherman Kent said don't touch her. Miss [REDACTED] is her name. But really, why does the Agency profit by kicking out a perfectly competent woman in order to make way for a 19 year old.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] You haven't talked to Dick Bissell, I gather. He feels strongly - retirement at 62.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: For everybody? irregardless?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I would hesitate to speak for him. He is more than capable of doing that for himself. Why don't you ask him for his druthers on this sometime?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think the Career Council wants to reassemble just for that purpose.

25X1A9a

COLONEL WHITE: I think I'm right in this, that we don't have very many people -- and really, with all due respect to Miss [REDACTED] or whatever her name is, I really doubt she is as efficient at 76 as someone somewhat younger - but I can see

SECRET

SECRET

how she might have been at 70 -- but I don't think we have very many more people who won't have in 15 years' service--because we took in all these people at a time when we weren't being very discriminate. But now we don't take them in.

MR. ECHOLS: We don't recruit people any longer who will not have 30 years' creditable service by age 60 - it's now only on a special exception basis. And I can speak to the question of recruitment that you raise. Last year we found it only necessary in the interest of proper recruitment to bring in I believe 12 hard-to-get types who would not meet this criteria of 30 years of creditable service at age 60. Actually, we had generally followed this practice, I'm told, some years before we ever had a policy on this. So apparently there is no problem - no real deterrent to recruitment -- although under this peculiar exercise we have just gone through [transfer of State Department BI and NIS to CIA] it probably has kept certain people from volunteering to accept CIA employment.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems to me the Retirement Board is already following a discretionary policy in this regard--

MR. HOUSTON: It's not really clear-cut in some areas. Take another one - that Garrison brought up. He has some Wage Board employees that are specialists in their field of printing or binding, or something -- they are good - they are specialists, and in fact their skill may increase -- and if he gets rid of them then he has to go out and recruit people and then train them. Now that is not something for the Retirement Board, that is a command decision. I think there is nothing in the present or proposed Regulation which would prevent Jim Garrison from making that determination.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I don't see any other way to run this thing except the way it is being run. The Retirement Board seems to have done a hell of a good job, as far as I can figure out, and they are terribly conscientious about it, and no matter how you legislate it you have to have something like this to get it done.

MR. HOUSTON: One fellow who had been fighting it quite hard and who said he wouldn't retire, and he had written to a Congressman, and to the White House, and I invited him in to talk over the situation and he said he was trying to get another job, and was cooperative.

25X1A9a

MR. BAIRD: How many people feel as [REDACTED] says they do, who say that

SECRET

SECRET

"If the Director tells me I should retire, I'll do it"?

MR. HOUSTON: No one else raised that question.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The Director couldn't have told him much more bluntly.

MR. BAIRD: That is what I think, but this [REDACTED] is a hardheaded 25X1A and he says, "If the Director tells me - but he hasn't -- if he says it's the policy of the Agency."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What more does he want?

MR. BAIRD: Maybe he wants something more. But that is why I asked if other people--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I thought the letter was just about as direct as it could be and still be reasonably polite.

MR. HOUSTON: I might mention two more things. We are trying to catch up now on a 5-year program of five years in advance routine notification. The letters have gone out now for the 1964 eligibles and will go out for the 1965 eligibles next week. These letters have been going to the components. I strongly feel that it should be a routine notice to the individual.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think to the individual. I don't know, maybe the Deputies feel differently, but here is a good case for a little psychology within the Agency, and as you [indicating Mr. Houston] said yourself, your Board has great merit in the fact that you are completely outside of the line supervision area, and therefore you have a lot more weight in what you say, and also the employee may feel you are being a little more objective, particularly if there is any friction in the area - which there is almost bound to be in many of these instances because a lot of these people are almost inevitably not supervisors and are supervised by someone younger than they. So I think the letters might in the first instance go to the individual, with a copy to the unit.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] There is one thing I might say about the experience of business and other agencies that have had this pre-retirement counseling - their experience has been otherwise, that it is better to go to the supervisor and let the supervisor notify the individual.

MR. HOUSTON: This we do on the two-year action. The five year action is just a pure notification. On the two year one the supervisor takes action.

SECRET

MR. BAIRD: I agree it should go to the employee, because the employee knows then that it's Agency policy -- even though [REDACTED] doesn't -- and not that it's the supervisor's policy or the head of the component's policy. It also enables him to go to his boss and say, "What do you propose to do with me at the end of five years?"

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: One of [REDACTED] objections was that it is discriminatory because some are forced to retire and others aren't -- which of course is illogical on his part. This reenforces your point.

MR. ECHOLS: I'd like clarification on one point here. I notice on this statistical report, Larry, that under your caption "Extended by the Retirement Board" there is a zero for the DD/I component. Does this mean that no cases have come before the Board from the DD/I that were favorably acted on?

MR. AMORY: I think it's because our own policy is as liberal as anything the Board would do, so they have been extended by us. I have down here 12 pending action between my Office and Personnel, and we extended 26.

MR. ECHOLS: In other words, your initial determinations may include not only the people you want to keep but--

MR. AMORY: You see, I have felt that at age 65 they're just as good as at 62, so I'm pretty tolerant, and if a person doesn't really want to retire, or if they have a mortgage that won't quite be paid up at age 62, I don't require a great deal of argument to let them go on to 65 -- because I think the most comparable situation in civilian life is 65 - they run 65, 66, and 68 -- and it's pretty hard to tell an economist who is working here and who has given up any chance at 62 to go to work anywhere except for charity that he can't work at least as long as his colleagues in the University of Wyoming or California, or anywhere else. So that is why our cases have been settled in the lower court and haven't gone to the Circuit Court of Appeals.

25X1A9a MR. HOUSTON: Mr. [REDACTED] keeps track of the eligibles and keeps constant contact with [REDACTED] For instance, here is a list from [REDACTED] noting the ones in the DD/I on which agreement has been reached. 25X1A9a

MR. ECHOLS: Does this mean the Board serves no purpose as far as the DD/I is concerned?

SECRET

SECRET

MR. BAIRD: It agrees with the action in the DD/I.

MR. AMORY: I'm pretty rough on people over 65. There might be somebody who wants to stay on from 65 to 70, and my people say, "No, you can't" - then he would be a case for the Board. Some of these may be in fact sort of deferred cases.

MR. ECHOLS: Our Agency Notice says that the Deputy Director may exempt them when there is a positive need for their services; the implication is that otherwise the case will go to the Board, which will consider personal preferences, personal circumstances, and so on. But as I understand it, under Bob Amory's procedure he makes the initial decision that for compassionate reasons, or because his performance is adequate, or because he needs the man, he makes the initial decision and it never goes to the Board.

MR. HOUSTON: This is why I said that in the early days, rightly or wrongly, we adopted different policy statements for different components. In the DD/I they said they wanted to maintain a more lenient attitude. This is partly the basic factor - there is no stated objective in this exercise.

MR. ECHOLS: The reason I asked this question is because this has been promulgated as an Agency Notice and now it should be converted to something more permanent.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And also, Larry, on your point about no stated objective, I think it would be very wise to have a stated policy in writing.

MR. HOUSTON: That is the most important thing I want to bring up here in this meeting - just how this objective will be stated. Frankly, the Board has been a little confused as to just what the objective was.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The objective mainly, as far as DD/P is concerned, is to keep the Agency young and the road to promotion more open.

MR. HOUSTON: But to say "keep the Agency young" doesn't really apply too much to Bob's shop.

MR. BAIRD: Is there any magic about 20 years of service over 19?

MR. ECHOLS: Oh yes indeed -- put together with age. The only thing I know about 20 years of service is that if a man has 20 years of service and is age 50 on an involuntary separation he can immediately get an annuity. That is the magic of 20 years.

SECRET

SECRET

MR. BAIRD: Well, I'm one who will have reached the age of retirement before I will have had 20 years' service.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] These are the principal beefs we get from fellows like [REDACTED]
25X1A9a [REDACTED] etc. 25X1A9a
25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] There is no difference between 20 at age 60--
MR. ECHOLS: These people have Social Security coverage--
MR. AMORY: You don't need very many years of Social Security--
MR. ECHOLS: 20 quarters, isn't it, Larry?
25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] It will eventually be up to 40 quarters by 1970 -- it's going up gradually.

COLONEL WHITE: I take it we all want to continue this policy. I feel very strongly we should; as a matter of fact, I don't see how in the world we could have a surplus personnel procedure and not have this too -- we must go ahead with it. And secondly, it seems to me we want to go ahead with the Board as it's presently constituted, with flexibility built into it as it is now. But there is a need for a clearer policy statement in a Regulation rather than in a Notice.

MR. HOUSTON: I think you are going to have to say something about the needs of the Agency consistent with the particular needs of the components.

COLONEL WHITE: I think I would suggest that the policy statement stay away from the compassionate reasons. I don't say that we should not be compassionate, but when you put that in - as to whether or not it's a financial hardship for someone to retire or not, it's always a financial hardship for most everybody retiring, and you get into a question of degree there which I think it would be bad to put into a Regulation. As far as the Regulation is concerned it should be based on the Agency's needs and not on compassion.

MR. AMORY: I thought the other way a year ago when we were discussing this, but Von argued your way, and so my so-called DD/I retirement procedures doesn't say anything about it.

MR. ECHOLS: If it is agreed, then, we will come forth with a new Regulation developed in collaboration with the Board, and try to build a fair statement in here as to objectives.

MR. HOUSTON: I have the next work on that because I have comments from

SECRET

SECRET

both Otto and Eric -- but if you will be thinking about a policy statement, too, we will appreciate it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think, to run through these points made by the IG: Point (a) - everybody agrees it has been effective for the Agency - statistics support it; Point (b) is that we know of no reason why, because there are rumors of Administration opposition to early retirement, that we should change ours.

MR. HOUSTON: In that connection, William P. Gullledge (Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service) at lunch said he thought they would be able to report out an even earlier retirement. He said probably a 1% reduction between age 50 and 55. And he said the Administration did present objections - but still, if it's the will of Congress--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The point being, we don't think we are out of step. Point (c) is there is no effect on recruiting that is visible.

MR. ECHOLS: No bad effect.

MR. BAIRD: How about Bob Amory's lateral entry -- when you get people in at the age of 35 or 40 because they are economists in short supply--

MR. AMORY: Well, we actually have not been hiring them for a good many years. In 10 years this problem will be virtually negligible. It's a problem with a finite end to it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Point (d) - the answer to that is the program has been interpreted liberally. Point (e) - if we're going to get out a Regulation, that takes care of that; and that would also take care of (f).

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Okay.

MR. ECHOLS: Agenda item 4: the object is to find out what your consensus is as to what we should be concentrating our attention on in the coming year.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Get the Career Service back on the track.

MR. ECHOLS: That is No. 1.

COLONEL WHITE: Are you going to take up the Career Development Board?

MR. ECHOLS: Yes. I have a list of things here. We postponed the establishment of the Career Development Board because we couldn't tackle that and run 701 at the same time, but I think the time for it is obviously at hand. We have

25X1A9a the DD/I and DD/P nominees - [REDACTED] unless you want to change them - because these nominations were made some months ago. But I would suggest that

SECRET

SECRET

if we get the nominations for the Board, the Board should be constituted immediately.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Who is the other nominee?

25X1A9a

COLONEL WHITE: [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

MR. ECHOLS: [REDACTED] And I

thought it would be a good idea to have the Board itself review this Regulation and sort of devise its own charter and policy statement.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] As far as 701 is concerned what made the difference in timing - of doing it now and not six months ago?

COLONEL WHITE: I really don't think -- as far as I was concerned, that wasn't the real reason. The real reason, I thought, was because it was premature to constitute this Board until the Director had taken action on the IG's survey on the training program of the Agency, in which there was another Board recommended, and when we discussed this my understanding was we decided to make it all one Board -- and that is what we were waiting on.

MR. ECHOLS: You're right -- it's right here in the minutes.

COLONEL WHITE: So there is no reason not to go ahead.

MR. ECHOLS: So we will constitute that Board immediately then, And I can make available to the Board the materials we have on hand -- past conversations as to the purpose of the Board and what its objectives should be, so they can start planning.

MR. BAIRD: Am I ex officio on that Board, or not?

MR. ECHOLS: You are indeed. Why do you say "ex"?

MR. BAIRD: Well, I'm not up to date as to what was the final decision.

No decision was made, was it?

MR. ECHOLS: We proposed--or I suggested, and I thought it was agreed, that the Personnel Development Board and the development of training programs to help in the development of people were so inseparable that we would have a joint activity. I thought that was agreed to.

MR. BAIRD: In effect, then, I am on the Board?

MR. ECHOLS: Yes indeed. And I am on the Board.

COLONEL WHITE: You [indicating Mr. Baird] and Emmett, and three other people.

SECRET

25X1A9a

MR. ECHOLS: [REDACTED] would like to propose as No. 1 priority--and I am not sure Mr. Bissell will agree with you--the reestablishment of the Career Service.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] On this I really don't care. I still think it's No. 1.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I agree with you. I think it's the most important thing we can do as a Board, and we ought to settle down and find out what is troubling the Career Service and see what can be done and take steps to get the morale up. This is a hell of a time to not have Career Service, because I think morale is at rock bottom.

Let's remember this, that this is for many of us the second time through this operation on a Career Service. Let us remember this time that a Career Service is not made by any legislation we put on the books, or by any regulations--it's made by the spirit behind it and what is done to back it up. One of the first priorities, I think, in the Career Service is after this Council decides what we want for a Career Service and how we are going to implement it then get something out - not with regulatory language, with all due respect to fine regulations, etc., but something out in just exactly the form of this little booklet that came out on the new building - about Career Service. If you can do it on a new building, which is built of stone, you can do it about something that is really built of spirit.

MR. BAIRD: But how much guts have you got?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What do you mean?

MR. BAIRD: It depends upon how much courage you have to make a Career Service which rewards the able at the expense of those who aren't able. In this business of ours I think you have to have a Service that really encourages top people coming in and top people staying. And if you are going to have a lot of other people that can do the humdrum things, tell them so. But you can't reward everybody and give them career development -- you can only do it by determining who are the people you really want to push, and then make it attractive to them. But that takes courage.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is all the more reason for this Council getting out something that is definitive and specific, because it will be backed up by action -- and this surplus group under 701, particularly in the DD/P area you're going to have people start feeling that you really mean it. But I think there is an urgency about

SECRET

SECRET

this, because I am personally concerned about the exodus of some people--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] And it hasn't started yet. In other words: "You ain't seen nothing yet."

MR. ECHOLS: Dick, have you anything else you want to submit for the DD/P?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I have an idea it's going to take awhile to get this one out of the way.

MR. AMORY: When will your first launch of the 701 be completed? The 1st of July, I heard.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] That is still what they're shooting for, but these things grind away.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You both must realize that on July 1 we are required to submit a progress report to the House Appropriations Committee.

MR. BAIRD: I would like to find out, just for my own education, how 701 is going. I know what I am doing, and I know I'm going to be very unpopular with those people that are going to be affected. But how is it going elsewhere?

MR. ECHOLS: Well, we have about five small exercises in process, some of which are right up to the gun where the Director is about to sign off on the separation of individuals by name. I got a report this morning on the DD/P status. Dick knows the situation better than I do. I'm told that sometime next week the memo to the Director establishing the existence of a surplus situation or an imbalance situation, and giving the numbers by grade, will go to the Director. And how long it will take to accomplish the required ranking by the Career Service after that? As expressed to me, they thought it would take a full 45 days - the 45 days permissible as provided for in the Regulation. So that will take us into July.

MR. BAIRD: I meant more is it really going to be pushed? Is it really going to get rid of people? Maybe in this we are talking about 50 people, agency-wide.

COLONEL WHITE: I have a paper that is quite far along. We have a surplus of seven in the "A" Service. I have another Panel meeting now on a surplus of eleven in the Management Staff. And another paper, which would go up on the 1st of July, in which there is a surplus of six in the Records Management Staff. There are some actions. How it will all come out, I don't know, but it's moving along.

MR. ECHOLS: I don't know whether DD/P would care to give an estimate of

SECRET

SECRET

what theirs might be.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I don't have any idea.

MR. ECHOLS: I have been told, but I wouldn't want to state it without your permission.

25X1A9a

MR. BAIRD: You're [indicating Mr. [REDACTED]] going to use it, aren't you?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I guess so.

MR. BAIRD: I sure hope so -- because I think that is going to be a help to keep and to get JOT's.

MR. ECHOLS: Another item on the agenda--and Dick Bissell isn't here-- is he nailed me at our last Supergrade Board Meeting and indicated he wanted the early retirement for the DD/P put back on the production line. I can give you a little rundown on the status of that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Before we get into that--isn't this a little inopportune? Of all the unhappy atmospheres over the last ten years I can't think of a less happy one to bounce this one out.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Who is going to take that up to the Congress? Why not be realistic about it.

COLONEL WHITE: We can't take it up to the Congress unless we have demonstrated we can do the best we can with this 701. But we can't get permission to take it up there, and we don't dare take it up there. But if Dick Bissell wants to have it discussed at the Career Council--

25X1A9a

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I move we defer discussion on it.

MR. [REDACTED] Why doesn't Emmett go and talk to Dick Bissell on this. We have exhausted this discussion; there isn't anything more to discuss.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We have drafted legislation, we have had legislation in Committees, and we have been told by the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the two Post Office and Civil Service Committees that if we are creating [an exceptional class] among career employees they will not consider it.

25X1A9a

So I agree with [REDACTED] that further discussion will not be profitable at this moment.

MR. ECHOLS: Okay. I will render a report to Mr. Bissell on what we have found out.

SECRET

SECRET

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Or you can take him several volumes of our minutes.

MR. ECHOLS: I think the Career Council could continue to work on ideas under which the program could be carried out, but I wouldn't recommend an active program.

Mr. Amory, do you have any specific requests for priority attention in our personnel program?

MR. AMORY: I don't think so.

COLONEL WHITE: You have the ones that came up at the DD/S Staff Meeting yesterday.

MR. ECHOLS: Yes, a couple came up at the DD/S Staff Meeting yesterday. One was a criticism that our overtime policy was not being uniformly applied. And particularly this affects the Office of Communications, because their people get around so much, and they find that their people, depending on where they are located, and so on, and what the conditions of employment are, they are under different supervisors who have different attitudes toward the application of Agency policy. And in addition, in the case of our JMARK Project a special overtime concept of a premium compensation plan was adopted, which is something not provided for by normal Agency regulations, so we have a new system of overtime compensation put into effect -- and this, of course, again created problems with the communications people who are assigned to the Project - instead of getting what they would normally have gotten under Agency published policy they found there was a tendency to pay them under a different program and different policy.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I suggest, Emmett, that you take a look at the minutes of the Career Council when this business of overtime was last discussed, in some great detail, including an analysis presented to the Council on how much overtime was worked in the various components, and what grades, and if after you have analyzed this you think you can achieve any change in the Career Council's attitude from what finally came out of those discussions then we might take it up again. My personal belief is we wouldn't.

COLONEL WHITE: I believe the policy is a good policy, and, just like Fitness Reports, we are going to continue to have some variations in the way in which it is administered. It might be worthwhile to have a short discussion on it

SECRET

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~SECRET~~

sometime, because I think we should strive for more uniformity in the way it is administered. But it's like striving for uniformity in other things - you're never going to get the ultimate. We ought to strive for more uniformity, but I don't think we ought to put an awful lot of time on it. And I think the policy is a good policy.

MR. ECHOLS: Matt Baird has had a Task Force working on the JOT Program. Are you going to make a report to the Career Council on that?

MR. BAIRD: Not today.

MR. ECHOLS: I didn't mean today.

MR. BAIRD: I would think the Career Development Board would be the better place to staff it out, before presenting any conclusions to the Career Council.

COLONEL WHITE: I think we should have, sometime during the course of the year, a presentation on that to the Career Council.

MR. ECHOLS: Also at Red's Staff Meeting yesterday there were complaints about the lack of comparable standards for the execution of Fitness Reports throughout the Agency -- not only throughout the Agency but differences among components.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I suggest on this subject--as you know, it's among the ones I mentioned to you--that at an early meeting we have a presentation made by [REDACTED] or whoever it would be, on Fitness Reports, and how they were doing, and ask if anybody has any ideas.

MR. ECHOLS: Are you implying the particular form is a bad form?

MR. AMORY: The form basically is a good one.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I'm not saying one way or the other - I'm simply asking for a review by experts who use them all the time.

MR. AMORY: I know I have difficulty in my own offices with some more hardnosed than others on it, and I think some kind of a statistical analysis of how many 1's, 2's and 3's, etc. - you could arrange a little tabulation, which would be mutually informative, and those who are giving the highest ones could urge their people to move down, and those who are going below could come up. Because there is no question about it that a person who moves around and has gotten a high evaluation in one place and then he shows up with a 3 or 4 two years later, when the question of competitive promotion comes up he is hurt. As long as he stays in the same office

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

~~SECRET~~

he's all right. Of course, this is the sort of thing you have in the military all the time.

COLONEL WHITE: There is one thing which has crept into practice which should be stopped. We should strive for more uniformity and just keep striving, but a lot of components now--I have one or two there and there are some in the DD/P, etc.--they will write right in there: This Fitness Report is made out under the standards of the Office of something or another--and it gives the connotation that these are their standards and they are not Agency standards. We ought to stop all of that stuff, because the employee gets the impression, "Well, I was rated according to the Comptroller standards, or EE standards, but they are different."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: This also gives him a very strong argument in case of selection out.

MR. ECHOLS: I question whether the motivation of these offices is to establish different standards. Most of these certifications are a rubber stamp deal, and they say, "When we say average, we mean average."

COLONEL WHITE: Well, we ought to say when the Agency says standard this means standard.

May I ask one question here. If we are going to get at this thing which seems very important to all of us - what is the Career Service, etc. - if we are going to get at this thing we are really going to have to do something besides meet here for an hour and a half, and I'm wondering if you all would be willing - go yourself or pick out a few selected people - to go down to [REDACTED] for two or three days, or whatever time is necessary, and really hammer this out. 25X1A6b

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes.

COLONEL WHITE: Because we will be here a year from now by just meeting once a month. If we went down there we could sit around a table and talk this thing out.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think the same thing might be true on the career concept thing - if we take a day or two down there and get this thing thrashed out - I think it's that vital for the sake of the Agency, because if we don't get it straightened out it's going to be one of the reasons we don't have an Agency.

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

~~SECRET~~

COLONEL WHITE: We need more than this group, really. But I think we ought to go down there and say we're going to stay there two or three days, away from the telephones, etc., and thrash it out.

. . . . The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL